



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/784,159	02/16/2001	Hiroshi Tanaka	FJ-2000-041 US	2743	
21254 7590 01/03/2007 MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			MISLEH,	MISLEH, JUSTIN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
·			2622		
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
,			01/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ŢĀĀ					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/784,159	TANAKA ET AL.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
<u>.</u> .	Justin P. Misleh	2622			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 01 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS					
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichev no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
<ul><li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li><li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ul>		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
<ul> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) rejected:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will will will will will will will wi	l be entered and an e	explanation of		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ils to provide a 1).		
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Attached Sheet.	•	n condition for allowar	nce because:		
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				

Application/Control Number: 09/784,159 Page 2

Art Unit: 2622

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 1, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- 2. Applicant's argues, "the Examiner indicated that he was interpreting the word 'parameter' as meaning the specific value of time/date associated with each image ... Therefore, under this interpretation, each image had a 'directory' associated with its specific values for time and date ... Applicants submit that one having ordinary skill in the art would not agree with the Examiner's interpretation of the word 'parameter' as meaning the specific values' (see argument spanning pages 21 and 22 of the response).
- 3. In support of the argument "one having ordinary skill in the art would not agree with the Examiner's interpretation of the word 'parameter' as meaning the specific values," Applicant points towards an excerpt from *Wikipedia*, the free encyclopedia and Applicant's specification. Moreover, Applicant concludes that "parameter" is intended to have its commonly accepted meaning similar to "category" (see 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph, page 22).
- 4. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's position. MPEP §2111.01 [R-5], section III, states, "The ordinary and customary meaning of a term may be evidenced by a variety of sources, including 'the words of the claims themselves, the remainder of the specification, the prosecution history, and extrinsic evidence concerning relevant scientific principles, the meaning of technical terms, and the state of the art."
- 5. As evidenced by the prosecution history, the Examiner essentially relies upon "parameter" as defined as "any factor that defines a system and determines (or limits) its performance" (see WordNet® 2.1. Princeton University. 19 Dec. 2006. <Dictionary.com

Art Unit: 2622

http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/parameter>). Moreover, the Examiner's interpretation is consistent with Applicant's own definition of "parameter" as being similar to "category."

Hence, one with ordinary skill in the art would clearly see how Tomat et al. provide the date ranges as the determining factor in categorizing/organizing the digital images (see figure 22).

Therefore, the Examiner maintains that each date range provided in the system object tree (194) corresponds to a different parameter that the digital images are stored under.

VIVEK SRIVASTAVA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600